11 12

13

14 15

> 16 17

18

19 20

21 22

2324

25

2627

28

> UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

HOWARD O. HOWELL,

03-CR-00281-MISC

Defendant.

NO. CR03-0281L

PLEA AGREEMENT

The United States of America, by and through John McKay, United States Attorney for the Western District of Washington, and Susan Loitz, Assistant United States Attorney for said District, and the defendant, Howard O. Howell, and his attorney, Brian Tsuchida, and enter into the following Agreement, pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11(c):

- 1. The Charges. Defendant, having been advised of the right to have this matter tried before a jury, agrees to waive that right and enter pleas of guilty to the following charges contained in the Indictment:
- a. Mail Fraud, as charged in Count 1, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1341;
- b. Wire Fraud, as charged in Count 6, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343; and
- c. Obtaining Information on Consumers Under False Pretenses, as charged in Count 12, in violation of Title 15, United States Code, Section 1681q.

wire communication in interstate or foreign commerce, a writing, sign, signal, picture, or

sound, to carry out or attempt to carry out an essential part of the scheme.

c. <u>Obtaining Information on Consumers under False Pretenses</u>: The elements of the offense of Obtaining Information on Consumers under False Pretenses as charged in Count 12, in violation of Title 15, Section 1681q, are as follows:

First, the Defendant knowingly and willfully obtained information on a consumer from a consumer reporting agency; and

Second, the Defendant did so under false pretenses.

3. The Penalties.

- a. <u>Mail Fraud</u>: Defendant understands that the statutory penalties for the offense of Mail Fraud, as charged in Count 1 are as follows: Imprisonment for up to five (5) years, a fine of up to two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000.00), a period of supervision following release from prison of up to three (3) years, and a one hundred dollar (\$100.00) penalty assessment. Defendant agrees that the penalty assessment shall be paid at or before the time of sentencing.
- b. <u>Wire Fraud</u>: Defendant understands that the statutory penalties for the offense of Wire Fraud, as charged in Count 6 are as follows: Imprisonment for up to five (5) years, a fine of up to two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000.00), a period of supervision following release from prison of up to three (3) years, and a one hundred dollar (\$100.00) penalty assessment. Defendant agrees that the penalty assessment shall be paid at or before the time of sentencing.
- c. Obtaining Information on Consumers Under False Pretenses:

 Defendant understands that the statutory penalties for the offense of Obtaining Information on Consumers Under False Pretenses as charged in Count 12 are as follows:

 Imprisonment for up to two (2) years, a fine of up to two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000.00), a period of supervision following release from prison of up to one (1) year, and a one hundred dollar (\$100.00) penalty assessment. Defendant agrees that the penalty assessment shall be paid at or before the time of sentencing.

The right to testify or to remain silent at trial, which such silence

The right to appeal a finding of guilt or any pretrial rulings.

PLEA AGREEMENT/ Howard O. Howell, CR 03-281L - 4

g.

h.

could not be used against Defendant; and

25

26

27

- 5. <u>Applicability of Sentencing Guidelines</u>. Defendant understands and lowledges the following:
- a. The United States Sentencing Guidelines, promulgated by the United States Sentencing Commission, are applicable to this case;
- b. The Court will determine Defendant's applicable Sentencing Guidelines range at the time of sentencing;
- c. The Court may impose any sentence authorized by law, including a sentence that, under some circumstances, departs from any applicable Sentencing Guidelines range up to the maximum term authorized by law;
- d. The Court is not bound by any recommendation regarding the sentence to be imposed, or by any calculation or estimation of the Sentencing Guidelines range offered by the parties, or by the United States Probation Department; and
- e. Defendant may not withdraw a guilty plea solely because of the sentence imposed by the Court.
- 6. <u>Ultimate Sentence</u>. Defendant acknowledges that no one has promised or guaranteed what sentence the Court will impose.
- 7. <u>Restitution</u>. Defendant shall make restitution in the amounts and to the persons and entities as shall be determined at the time of sentencing.
- 8. <u>Loss</u>. The United States and Defendant agree that a reasonable estimate of the loss for purposes of the Sentencing Guidelines based on available information is more than two million five hundred thousand dollars (\$2,500,000.00) and less than five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00).
- 9. <u>Departures</u>. The United States and Defendant agree that neither party will ask the Court to depart from the sentencing range established by the applicable Sentencing Guidelines as determined by the Court.
- 10. <u>Statement of Facts</u>. The parties agree on the following facts in support of Defendant's guilty pleas and for purposes of calculating the base offense level of the Sentencing Guidelines. Defendant admits he is guilty of the charged offenses.

24

25

26

The Defendant had a majority ownership interest in and operated a business known as Touch Menus, Inc. Touch Menus, Inc.'s business involved the development and sale of certain computer and related hardware and computer software whose principal application was in the restaurant business. Among other things, the products allowed restaurant servers to take and enter orders electronically at table side. Touch Menus products were also used in the fast food industry. The Defendant also operated as a sole proprietorship a business known as CompuLease. CompuLease entered into leases with restaurants for lease of the products developed and sold by Touch Menus, Inc.

Beginning in approximately 1988, the Defendant began a business relationship with Farrel Price, who provided financing for the Defendant's businesses. The financing took place through a mechanism known as sale/lease-

In the typical transaction, Price or one of several entities related to Price which shall be collectively referred to as "the Farrel Price Entities", or one of the friends or family of Farrel Price and their related entities who also did business with

26

27

¹The "Farrel Price Entities" included the following:

AFP Enterprises Limited Partnership

Progressive Funding LLC

Personal Success Systems, Inc.

Price Carlson Funding LLC (50% with Richard Carlson) Price Funding LLC (50% with Bradley Price)

the Defendant and who shall be collectively referred to as the "Other Investors"², would purchase from the Defendant certain Touch Menus products, which Price, a Farrel Price Entity or Other Investor would lease-back to the Defendant, thereby creating a debt owed by the Defendant to Price, a Farrel Price Entity or Other Investor. The Defendant through CompuLease would in turn lease the products to a restaurant customer, and pledge the lease with the restaurant customer as collateral for the debt owed by Defendant to Price, a Farrell Price Entity or Other Investor. Although the sale/lease-back financing transactions were legitimate at the outset, the Defendant later reverted to lies and deception in the course of his business dealings with Price, the Farrel Price Entities and the Other Investors.

By approximately 1995, and continuing until on or about January 5, 2001. the Defendant devised and carried out a scheme and artifice to obtain money from Price, the Farrel Price Entities and the Other Investors based on false and fraudulent pretenses, representations and promises. In order to induce Price, the Farrel Price Entity or Other Investor to enter into a sale/lease-back arrangement and thereby provide money to the Defendant or his businesses, the Defendant would present to Price, the Farrel Price Entity or Other Investor a purported lease with a restaurant customer, along with a credit report for that customer. Based on the representations reflected by these documents, Price, the Farrel Price Entity or Other Investor would provide the financing to the Defendant pursuant to the sale/lease-back arrangement

21

24

25

26

28

²The "Other Investors" included the following:

Bradley Price (Farrel Price's son) and related entities:

Bradley and Laura Price IRAs Northwest Quality Properties Inc.

Price Funding LLC (50% with Farrel Price)

Glenn Kalmus

Kalmus Funding LLC

LaNae Dance

Lincoln Financial Service LLC

Richard Carlson 27

Price Carlson Funding LLC (50% with Farrel Price)

described above. However, the purported leases with the restaurant customer were fabricated. The Defendant had chosen both the names of the restaurants and names of individuals, sometimes randomly from the phone book; prepared lease agreements with those names; forged the purported lessees' signatures; and attached credit reports for the purported restaurant owners that he had obtained from Equifax, a consumer reporting agency, under the false pretenses that he had legitimate business transactions with the consumers. In fact, the purported restaurant owners did not own the restaurants, and, the restaurants had no leases with the Defendant or CompuLease. Having devised this scheme and artifice to defraud, the Defendant obtained money from Price, the Farrel Price Entities and Other Investors through such false and fraudulent pretenses, representations and promises.

On or about April 18, 2000, for the purpose of executing the scheme and artifice to defraud and attempting to do so, and for the purpose of obtaining money by means of false and fraudulent material pretenses, representations and promises, the Defendant knowingly caused to be sent from Henderson, Nevada, for delivery to him at 13609 NE 26th Place, Bellevue, Washington, within the Western District of Washington, by commercial interstate carrier, specifically Federal Express, a check in the sum of sixty thousand dollars (\$60,000.00) in connection with a transaction with one of the Other Investors, specifically Lincoln Financial Services LLC, in which he had fabricated and forged one or more leases.

On or about September 12, 1998, for the purpose of executing the scheme and artifice to defraud and attempting to do so, and for the purpose of obtaining money by means of false and fraudulent material pretenses, representations and promises, the Defendant knowingly caused transmission of writings, signs, signals, pictures and/or sounds by wire communication in interstate commerce, specifically by using a computer system in the Western District of Washington to access electronic data in a computer system in the state of Georgia, and obtain from it a

 credit report on an individual whose initials are H.Y., which individual he had falsely and fraudulently represented to one of the Farrel Price Entities, specifically A. Farrel Price Family Limited Partnership, as a legitimate party to a lease for restaurant equipment.

On or about September 12, 1998, the Defendant knowingly and willfully obtained and caused to be obtained a credit report on a consumer whose initials are H.Y. from a consumer reporting agency under false pretenses, that is the Defendant obtained the credit report when he had no legitimate business transactions with the consumer but instead obtained the credit report as part of his scheme to defraud A. Farrel Price Family Limited Partnership.

11. Non-Prosecution of Additional Offenses. As part of this Plea Agreement, the United States Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington agrees to move to dismiss the remaining counts in the Indictment at the time of sentencing and not to prosecute Defendant for any additional offenses known to it as of the time of this Agreement that are based upon evidence in its possession at this time, or that arise out of the conduct giving rise to this investigation. In this regard, Defendant recognizes that the United States has agreed not to prosecute all of the criminal charges that the evidence establishes were committed by Defendant solely because of the promises made by Defendant in this Agreement. Defendant acknowledges and agrees, however, that for purposes of preparing the Presentence Report, the United States Attorney's Office will provide the United States Probation Office with evidence of all relevant conduct committed by Defendant.

Defendant agrees and acknowledges that any charges to be dismissed before or at the time of sentencing were substantially justified in light of the evidence available to the United States, were not vexatious, frivolous or taken in bad faith, and do not provide Defendant with a basis for any future claims under the "Hyde Amendment," Pub.L. No. 105-119 (1997).

- 12. Acceptance of Responsibility. The United States acknowledges that if Defendant qualifies for an acceptance of responsibility adjustment pursuant to USSG § 3E1.1(a) and if the offense level is sixteen (16) or greater, Defendant's total offense level should be decreased by three (3) levels pursuant to USSG §§ 3E1.1(a) and (b), because Defendant has assisted the United States by timely notifying the authorities of his intention to plead guilty, thereby permitting the United States to avoid preparing for trial and permitting the Court to allocate its resources efficiently.
- 13. <u>Voluntariness of Plea</u>. Defendant acknowledges that he has entered into this Plea Agreement freely and voluntarily, and that no threats or promises, other than the promises contained in this Plea Agreement, were made to induce Defendant to enter this plea of guilty.
- 14. Statute of Limitations. In the event that this Agreement is not accepted by the Court for any reason, or Defendant has breached any of the terms of this Plea Agreement, the statute of limitations shall be deemed to have been tolled from the date of the Plea Agreement to: (1) 30 days following the date of non-acceptance of the Plea Agreement by the Court; or (2) 30 days following the date on which a breach of the Plea Agreement by Defendant is discovered by the United States Attorney's Office.
- Agreement apply only to conduct that occurred prior to the execution of this Agreement. If, after the date of this Agreement, Defendant should engage in conduct that would warrant an increase in Defendant's adjusted offense level or justify an upward departure under the Sentencing Guidelines (examples of which include, but are not limited to: obstruction of justice, failure to appear for a court proceeding, criminal conduct while pending sentencing, and false statements to law enforcement agents, the probation officer or Court), the United States is free under this Agreement to seek a sentencing enhancement or upward departure based on that conduct.
- 16. <u>Completeness of Agreement</u>. The United States and Defendant acknowledge that these terms constitute the entire Plea Agreement between the parties. This Agreement

1	only binds the United States Attorney's Office for the Western District of Washington. I
2	does not bind any other United States Attorney's Office or any other office or agency of
3	the United States, or any state or local prosecutor.
4	Dated this/3_ day of August, 2003.
5	
6	
7	Aro. Hull
8	HOWARD O. HOWELL Defendant
9	
10	T80
11	BRIAN TSUCHIDA Attorney for Defendant
12	Autorite's for Bereadant
13	
14	SUSAN LOITZ
15	Assistant United States Attorney
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

It